



UNITED STATE **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 1 PL

-	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ΥϦ	
٠	09/506,430	02/17/00	GREEN	EDINVENTOR		ATTORNEY-DOCKET NO.	
ſ	— Townsend An	d Townsend	HM12/0524 And Crew	· ¬	LUKTON	X AMINER	
	Steuart Street Tower 20th One Market Plaza San Francisco CA 94105				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 05/24 700	
				•	DATE MAILED:		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/506,430

Green

Group Art Unit

	David Lukton	1653				
X Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Feb 17, 2000</u>						
☐ This action is FINAL .						
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay\(\text{1835}\)) (C1) 11: 453 () (C 213					
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extens 37 CFR 1.136(a).	to expire 30 DAUS					
Disposition of Claim						
		is/are pend	ing in the applicat			
Of the above, claim(s)						
☐ Claim(s)		is/ore	nom consideration			
☐ Claim(s)		is/are	allowed.			
Claim(s)		is/are	rejected.			
☐ Claim(s) Xì Claims <i>1-17</i>		ıs/are	objected to.			
Claims <u>1-17</u> are subject to restriction or election requirement						
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin The drawing(s) filed on	is approved during approved approved during approved during approved approved during	en _ ·				
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper N Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	8					
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON	THE FOLLOWING PAGES		i			

A restriction is imposed, as set forth below. First, however, the following subgenera are defined:

G1: the pathological condition is limited to the following: hemangiomas, malignant and benign tumors, tumors of the meninges, intracerebral tumors, sarcomas, osteosarcomas, soft tissue tumors, tumors of the eophagus and tumors of the trachea

G2: the pathological condition is limited to the following: chronic liver infection, chronic hepatitis, substance-induced neovascularization of the liver, angiogenic dysfunction related to an excess of hormone, angiogenic dysfunction related to an excess of estrogen, neovascular sequelae of diabetes, central serous chorioretinopathy

G3: the pathological condition is limited to the following: neovascular sequelae to hypertension, neovascularization in a post-recovery cerebrovascular accident, neovascularization due to head trauma, restenosis following angioplasty, neovascularization due to heat or cold trauma

G4: the R'-Glu-Trp-R" dipeptide is limited to the following:

His-Glu-Trp Cpr-Glu-Trp-OH Glu-His-Glu-Trp But-Glu-Trp-OH Gly-Glu-Trp Arg-Lys-Glu-Trp-Tyr Glu-Trp-Lys-His-Gly Arg-Lys-Glu-Trp Glu-Trp-Lys-Lys-His-Gly Lys-Glu-Trp-Tyr Glu-Trp-NH-NH-Gly-His-Lys-NH, Lys-Glu-Trp Ac-Glu-Trp-OH pGlu-Trp-OH Suc-Glu-Trp-OH Glu-Trp (per se)

G5: the R'-Glu-Trp-R" dipeptide can be whatever the claims permit, including G4; however, with the exception of the specific peptides listed in G4, neither R' nor R" can represent a peptide, and neither R' nor R" can contain amino acids.

G6: within the R'-Glu-Trp-R" dipeptide, R' and R" can represent or contain amino acids, with the proviso that subgenus G6 excludes subgenus G5.

*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

- 1. Claims 1-4, 7-13, 16, 17, drawn to a method of treating a subject afflicted with a condition that includes G1, but excludes G2 and G3, said method comprising administering any peptide, including G5, provided that G6 is excluded, classified in, e.g., 514/19.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-13, 17, drawn to a method of treating a subject afflicted with a condition that includes G2, but excludes G1 and G3, said method comprising administering any peptide, including G5, provided that G6 is excluded, classified in, e.g., 514/19.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-13, 17, drawn to a method of treating a subject afflicted with a condition that includes G3, but excludes G1 and G2, said method comprising administering any peptide, including G5, provided that G6 is excluded, classified in, e.g., 514/19.
- 4. Claim 1, drawn to a method of treating a subject afflicted with a condition that includes G1, but excludes G2 and G3, said method comprising administering any peptide, including G6, provided that G5 is excluded, classified in, e.g., 530/328, classified in, e.g., 514/19.
- 5. Claim 1, drawn to a method of treating a subject afflicted with a condition that includes G2, but excludes G1 and G3, said method comprising administering any peptide, including G6, provided that G5 is excluded, classified in, e.g., 530/328.

6. Claim 1, drawn to a method of treating a subject afflicted with a condition that includes G3, but excludes G1 and G2, said method comprising administering any peptide, including G6, provided that G5 is excluded, classified in, e.g., 530/328.

7. Claims 14-15, drawn to a method of treating a subject with a binary mixture of active agents, classified in, e.g., 514/19.

The claimed inventions are distinct.

The inventions are distinguished on the basis of the peptides used, and the conditions treated. The restriction is predicated on the view that, notwithstanding the recitation of the term "neovascularization" in the claim, a reference can form the basis for a valid §103 or §102 even if the term at issue is not recited in the document. Thus, a search would have to be conducted for disclosures of Glu-Trp- containing peptides for treatment of one disorder or another, and subsequently a determination made as to whether there are assertions in other documents that angiogenesis or neovascularization is peripherally involved in the etiology or progression of the disorder in question. Thus, while a search in parent application 08/614,764 (now USP 5,902,790) could have been limited to documents that recite the term "neovascularization", such is not the case here.

In the event that any of Groups 1-3 is elected, and claims therein found allowable, Group 7 will be rejoined for further examination (subject to the same limitations).

Applicant is advised that for the response to this requirement to be complete, an election of the invention to be examined must be indicated, even if the requirement is traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

In addition to the foregoing, applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The first specie is a specific peptide (presumably Glu-Trp); the second specie is a specific disorder that is the target of the treatment.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are witten in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentable distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton. Phone: (703) 308-3213.

An inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

DAVID LURCTON
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1800